

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Medlin *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,073,586). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The rejection is substantially based on the supposition that “any fan in a window would restrict the transmission of light through the window to some extent.” This rejection does not apply to independent Claims 1 and 11, as amended herein, which define a “fan having at least one light-adjusting component that restricts the transmission of light.” Medlin does not teach any features of a ventilation fan and, therefore, does not teach a fan having a light-adjusting component.

Claim 7 is further removed from Medlin since the curtain 17 of Medlin is not an automatic climate control.

Claim 8 is further removed from Medlin since Medlin shows fan 21 at a location different from cooling pad 32, which pad is misinterpreted to be “shutter” in the Office Action. The term “shutter” does not appear in Medlin. Thus, the pad 32 of Medlin is not a shutter and is not associated with a fan.

Claim 10 is patentable over Medlin for reasons given for Claim 8, and further because in the arrangement of Medlin, the curtain 12 associated with cooling pad 32 does not function to control light.

Claim 11 is patentable over Medlin for reasons given with respect to Claim 1 above.

Claims 17, 18 and 20 are patentable over Medlin for reasons given with respect to respective Claims 7, 8 and 10 above.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that Claims 2-6, 9, 12-16 and 19 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. The allowability of Claims 2-6, 9, 12-16 and 19 is appreciated.

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims, 1-20, are patentable for reasons given herein. Allowance of same is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the

Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 8 December 2004

By: Linda M. Deschere
Linda M. Deschere
Reg. No. 34,811

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

LDES/lf-s

G:\ldescher\9948\IP\000017.COB\OA due 12-09-04\Amendment.doc